

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 15 are independent. In the Final Office Action February 14, 2006, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-15 and 18-20 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action February 14, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,187 ("*Dickelman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,392,640 ("*Will*") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,848 ("*Nowlan*"). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "determining whether the one character of text comprises a single word wherein determining whether the one character of text comprises the single word comprises determining, prior to receiving another character of text, that the one character of text comprises a character other than a period."

Amended Claim 15 includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, any reasonable combination of *Dickelman* and *Will* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, as stated by the Examiner, *Dickelman* and *Will* do not explicitly state determining whether the at least

one character of text includes a period. (See Office Action, page 4, lines 3-4.) Furthermore, *Nowlan* does not overcome *Dickelman's* and *Will's* deficiency. *Nowlan* merely discloses that a data entry apparatus (10) receives a first character key from a keypad (12). (See Abstract, lines 1-2.) A set of characters associated with the first character key in *Nowlan* is displayed. (See Abstract, lines 2-3.) In addition, a second character key from the keypad (12) is received in *Nowlan*, wherein a second set of characters is associated with the second character key. (See Abstract, lines 3-5.) Like *Dickelman* and *Will*, *Nowlan* at least does not teach or suggest determining whether the one character of text comprises a single word. Consequently, like *Dickelman* and *Will*, *Nowlan* at least does not teach or suggest determining whether the one character of text comprises the single word comprises determining, prior to receiving another character of text, that the one character of text comprises a character other than a period. In contrast, *Nowlan* is silent as to any order or process for receiving and detecting a period in a text stream. In other words, while *Nowlan* discloses displaying a set of characters associated with the first character key (See Abstract, lines 2-3), it does not disclose, prior to receiving another character of text, determining whether one character of text comprises a period, acting upon this detection, or receiving another character. Consequently, *Nowlan* does not teach or suggest determining whether the one character of text comprises a single word. Nor does *Nowlan* teach or suggest determining whether the one character of text comprises the single word comprises determining, prior to receiving another character of text, that the one character of text comprises a character other than a period.

In short, combining *Dickelman* and *Will* with *Nowlan* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Dickelman*, *Will*, and *Nowlan*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest “determining whether the one character of text comprises a single word wherein determining whether the one character of text comprises the single word comprises determining, prior to receiving another character of text, that the one character of text comprises a character other than a period”, as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 15 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 15 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 15.

Dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 15, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-14 and 18-20.

## II. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and  
charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2006

By:

  
D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946  
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:mdb